

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-12, 14-18, 20, and 21 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 8, 17, 20, and 21 are now amended. Claims 4, 5, 13, and 19 are now cancelled. The claim amendments are fully supported by the application as filed and do not present new subject matter. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION AND CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The specification and a number of claims stand objected to due to certain informalities. Specifically, the Office Action indicates that the term "cyclic redundancy check" should be amended to read "cyclic redundancy check code" in the specification and claims. Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art will understand that "cyclic redundancy check" includes "cyclic redundancy check code." Therefore, no amendments to the specification or claims to clarify the term "cyclic redundancy check" are necessary. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the specification and claim objections.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that the recitation of "stand-alone data packets" is not clear. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicant submits that recitation of "stand-alone data packets" as used in the context of the application is clear to one of ordinary skill in the art. The claimed packets are "stand-alone data packets" because each packet is independently addressable and

can be discarded and retransmitted if it is determined that the packet was transmitted with error.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4-15, 17-19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jedwab (U.S. Pat. No. 5,778,013). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent Claims 1 and 17 recite, in part, "removing the check sequences from the superframe to separate the data packets from the check sequences; condensing said check sequences into a single reduced bit count check sequence equivalent using an error correction code; combining the reduced bit count check sequence equivalent with the superframe to form a reduced bit count superframe."

Amended independent Claim 8 recites, in part, "a condensing device operable to condense said at least one check sequence using an error correction code into a check sequence equivalent that is smaller than said at least one check sequence; a condensing device operable to use an error correction code to condense said at least one check sequence into a check sequence equivalent that is smaller than said at least one check sequence."

The Jedwab reference fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of amended Claims 1, 8, and 17. In particular, the Jedwab reference fails to disclose or suggest condensing multiple check sequences into a single reduced bit count check sequence equivalent using an error correction code. The Office Action cites column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 6 as allegedly teaching condensing of multiple check

sequences into a single reduced bit count check sequence equivalent using error correction code. However, Jedwab simply discloses the use of a “verification device 18” for verifying CRC code after a message has already been received. The Jedwab reference fails to disclose or suggest condensing check sequences into a single reduced bit count check sequence equivalent using an error correction code before transmission, as claimed.

The Office Action also cites U.S. Patent No. 5,007,055 to Isono et al. to support the assertion that “CRC coding is well known in the art as an error correction code.” See Office Action at 7. However, the Isono et al. fails to disclose condensing check sequences into a single reduced bit count check sequence equivalent using an error correction code, as substantially set forth in independent Claims 1, 8, and 17.

As set forth above, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of amended Claims 1, 8 and 17. Therefore, the cited art fails to anticipate or render obvious Claims 1, 8, and 17, as well as those claims dependent therefrom. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 102 rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 16, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Jedwab reference in further view of the Isono et al. reference. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of Claims 3, 16, and 20 are dependent on one of amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 17. As set forth above, amended dependent Claims 1, 8, and 17 are not anticipated or obvious in light of the cited art. Therefore, Claims 3, 16, and 20 are


also not obvious in light of the cited art at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2-21-07

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686
Brent G. Seitz, Reg. No. 54,435

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
[MDE/BGS/cn]